



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,806	06/06/2000	Li Mo	064731.0143	9568

7590 07/02/2003

Terry J Stalford Esq
Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

HARPER, KEVIN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2666

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

17

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/588,806

Applicant(s)

MO ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin C. Harper

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 30-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-29 and 34-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/6/00 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-11.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Drawings

1. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on April 16, 2001. These drawings are disapproved.(see objections below).
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include reference signs 12, 50 and 52 mentioned on pages 13-15 in the disclosure.
3. Figure 1 is objected to because reference number 32 (far right, top) points to the dotted line of item 64 instead of the solid line representing an inter-nodal link.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made

Art Unit: 2666

in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-10, 12-29 and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dobbins et al. (US 5,684,800).

4. Regarding claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 12-13, 15, 16-23, 26-27, 29 and 34-37, Dobbins discloses a transport element (Figure ^S~~1~~, items 11-14) comprising a port group (items 17-19; abstract, lines 1-4) which comprises several ports, point-to-multipoint connectivity between the ports (col. 3, lines 6-25; note: a broadcast packet from any member of a VLAN will be transmitted to all other members of the VLAN), and an identifier operable to represent the port group as a single element (abstract, lines 1-6; note: VLAN-IDs). However, Dobbins does not disclose that the identifier represents the port group as a single element to disparate elements (Figure 1, items 20). One skilled in the art would recognize that broadcast or multicast addresses allow an end node to transmit to several nodes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a port group identifier that identifies the port group as a single element in the invention of Dobbins in order to simplify routing of data packets to multiple destinations.

5. Regarding claims 4, 6, 14, 28 and 38, Dobbins does not disclose that the transport element interconnects IP routers or Frame Relay switches. One skilled in the art would recognize that a network node operates under a protocol suitable to the network based on design, cost, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have IP routers or Frame Relay switches in the invention of Dobbins in order to accommodate various commonly used protocols.

6. Regarding claims 10, 24-25, 39 and 40, an inherent processor (Figure 3) generates and distributes routing information (Figure 3, item 88).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 30-33 are allowed.
8. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Suzuki et al. (US 5,892,912) and Momirov (US 6,2165,167) each discloses port groupings in a communications network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Harper whose telephone number is 703-305-0139. The examiner can normally be reached weekdays, except Wednesday, from 9:30 AM to 8:00 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema S. Rao, can be reached at 703-308-5463. The fax number for Technology Center (TC) 2600 is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office for TC 2600 at 703-306-0377.

Kevin C. Harper



June 30, 2002